Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mucro 140 long, 45 broad at base. Fruit borne chiefly on the last division of the leaves, and sporophydia solitary, with few spirals; nucleus brown, with *five* rather prominent angles, 250-260 long, 240-245 broad. Antheridia 170 in diameter, borne on the summit of the last division of the leaf.

The old capsule of the nucleus seems quite persistent, remaining adherent long after the coronula has fallen, and resembling brown parchment-like wings along the spiral angles of the nucleus.

Plant gathered by the Rev. Thos. Morong, on the island of Nantucket, in a very muddy pool, July 21st, 1887.

Plate LXXV., Fig 1.—Plant natural size, with the numerous, crowded, axillary and terminal, contracted, fertile spikes; these fertile spikes generally arise within a verticil of sterile leaves, most of which whorl. 2, a portion of a fertile spike, × 25 diam.; on the lower verticil a leaf is twice divided, bearing on each division four mucronate terminals; on the upper verticil, once divided, with three terminals and fruiting organs. 3, the mucronate extremity of a leaf × 50 diam. 4, a nucleus with five angles × 25 diam.

Bibliographical Notes on well known Plants.—IV.

BY EDWARD L. GREENE.

NELUMBO LUTEA, Baillon, Hist. Pl. iii., 79 (1872).
Cyamus luteus, Nutt., Gen. ii., 25 (1818).
Nelumbium luteum, Willd. Spec. Pl. ii., 1289 (1799).
Nymphæa Nelumbo, var. *β*. Linn. Spec. Pl. 511 (1753).

Books on the botany of the Atlantic States which have been written within the last fifty years, have all been perpetuating a Candollean mistake respecting the rightful name of this our grandest water-lily; for *Nelumbium*, so far from being the oldest, is, in truth, the most recent of all, having been invented by Willdenow in 1799. *Cyamus* of Salisbury (1805), later in finding a modern application, is the ancient Greek name of the genus. For twenty years or more after Salisbury took it up, it was adopted, to the suppression of *Nelumbium*, by authors as prominent as Smith, Nuttall and Barton; but the elder De Candolle restored *Nelumbium*, and has had a large following. The reasons which he gave for his action were, that *Cyamus* had been applied to a genus of animals, and that *Nelumbium* was the oldest of the names propounded for these plants since the establishment of the Linnæan nomenclature. This last assertion will not hold; and, what is somewhat puzzling is, that he even cites the refutation of his statement, in the synonymy of the genus, where we read " *Nelumbo*, Adans." Would he be understood as classing Adanson with pre-Linnæan authors? He was a contemporary of Linné, indeed, but the Familles des Plantes, containing his definitions and names of genera, did not appear until 1763, ten years subsequent to the full promulgation of the Linnæan nomenclature; and this gives to his *Nelumbo*, as a post-Linnæan name, a priority of thirty-six years over Willdenow's *Nelumbium*.

I do not know in what esteem the work of Adanson, as a systematic botanist, has been held by later generations, or even by his contemporaries. In my reading I have come upon very little in the line of discussion of his merits. I can think it possible that his marked originality, and his incisive and sometimes a little unjust criticisms of Linné, should have made him singular among the botanists of his time, who, almost with one consent, paid homage to the Swedish luminary, while he withheld it. Then, again, his curious tabulated placing of generic characters, which were, after all, short and imperfect; and also his too free adoption of Oriental and otherwise objectionable names, all may have conspired to overshadow merits which, I think, were very considerable. Perhaps so late as the year 1821 a strongly prevailing prejudice against this author may have influenced even De Candolle in his practical ignoring of *Nelumbo;* and it has been left to an eminent authority of our own time, Prof. Baillon, to make the needful restitution.

Nelumbo is Ceylonese, and, for aught we know, may be older than even the Greek *Cyamus*. Its earliest appearing in Occidental scientific literature was made in 1698, in Paul Hermann's beautiful work entitled Paradisus Batavus, which, although reprinted in 1705, is now a rare book. But this author, judging it to be a species of *Nymphæa,* only cited *Nelumbo* as the aboriginal name of the plant. Tournefort in 1700 pronounced it the type of a new genus, taking up this Ceylonese name ; and so the genus should be credited to him. Linné, who now and then seemed affected by a singular blindness to generic characters in plants, named it *Nymphæa Nelumbo,* and made our fine American species a mere variety of it.

It is to be noted, finally, that among post-Linnæan authors of the last century, not only Adanson, but also the illustrious Joseph Gærtner (1788), insisted upon the validity of the genus, and upon *Nelumbo* as its rightful name.

NEMACAULIS DENUDATA, Nuttall, in Journ. Acad. Philad., ser. 2, i., 168 (1848).

Nemacaulis Nuttallii, Benth., in DC. Prodr., xiv., 23 (1856); Torr. and Gray, in Proc. Am. Acad., viii., 146 (1870); Watson, Bot. Cal., ii., 16 (1880).

Eriogonum denudatum, Curran, in Bull. Cal. Acad., i., 274 (1885).

From a rather superficial examination of the specimens which have induced the proposition made by Mrs. Curran, I am disposed to think well of it, and that so, the name which I have placed as the latest synonym may perhaps worthily supersede the others. But I also perceive that the alternative course of adding a species or two to *Nemacaulis* and retaining it as a genus, might possibly be found the better way. However, the above ordering of names best exhibits how a consensus of authors may deal with the rights and prerogatives of another, through a long series of years.

Nuttall, one of the most laborious and successful men who ever worked for thirty-four years in the field of North American botany, discovered the plants and founded the genus *Nemacaulis,* deeming the species two, and naming them respectively *N. denudata* and *N. foliosa.* When, a few years afterwards, it fell in Mr. Bentham's way to take up the genus, he seemed to find that the species was but one. Then, instead of following the ordinary practice of authors in such cases, and leaving the descriptive and quite unobjectionable *N. denudata,* Nutt., in its place, writing *N. foliosa* as a synonym, he displaced both the names of Nuttall and made himself the author of the species by writing

N. Nuttallii; and this, which a fearless critic might call a bit of scientific iniquity, has been adopted and made his own by each American author who has, since Bentham's time, handled the Eriogoneæ, as all our books and catalogues will show.

CHÆNACTIS SANTOLINOIDES, Greene, Bull. Torr. Bot. Club, ix., 17 (1882); Gray, Syn. Fl. i., part 2, p. 341 (1884).

This plant has little bibliography, but more than is given it in the Synoptical Flora, where the author of the work says in effect, that it was, up to that date, unpublished. It had been described two and a half years before, in the February number of this journal for that year.

Note on Mollugo verticillata, L.

"Stamens, five; sometimes three or ten; filaments setaceous, shorter than and opposite to the sepals." The above from Wood; and further, in the detail, he notes: "Stamens mostly three."

One can understand that there ought to be five or ten, the rest being suppressed. I have made it a point to look at some in passing every few days the past season, and there have always been but three, except in one case four. I find, however, that "stamens opposite the sepals" applies to only two, the other one of the three being uniformly alternate with the sepals. Assuming that the normal stamens should be in a whorl of five, this alternate stamen should belong to a second whorl of five. In cases where there is a double whorl of stamens, as in six-stamened monocotyledons, there is usually some difference between the inner and outer whorl—if it be only a little difference in the time of maturity of the anthers. In these three stamens I see no difference, which is remarkable if they really belong to different whorls.

It is interesting to note how well the arrangements are adapted to self-fertilization. The filaments are tightly appressed to the ovarium, and curve over at the apex, pressing the anther down on the stigmas. After the expansion of the flower the anthers remain in this position. The pollen is ejected from the anther cells simultaneously with the expansion of the sepals, covering the stigmas.